REMARKS:

In the office action, the abstract was objected to for being of an improper format. As the examiner can see, the abstracted has been corrected to delete the phrase "is proposed" at page 16, line 2. The statement regarding purported merits at page 16, lines 8 to 9 has also been deleted.

Similarly, page 1, line 2 has been corrected to refer to "the benefit of" rather than "priority under".

Claims 1 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Cook, Jr. et al.

Claims 1, 4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Jones.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Kelley.

It is believed that the cancellation of these claims renders these rejections moot.

In the aforementioned office action, the examiner indicated that "claims 2 and 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims".

As the examiner can see, new claim 10 corresponds to original claims 1 and 2 and new claim 17 corresponds to original claims 1 and 3. Similarly, new claims 11 and 18 correspond to original claim 4; new claims 12 and 19 correspond to original claim 5; new claims 13 and 20 correspond to original claim 6; new claims 14 and 21 correspond to original daim 7; new claims 15 and 22 correspond to original claim 8; and new claims 16 and 23 correspond to original claim 9.

It is believed that the amendments put the application in good order for allowance.

Further and more favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

A. Kirby Nicholson

Michael R. Williams Registration 45,333

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada Telephone (204) 947-1429 - FAX (204) 942-5723

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) 872-9306, on March 28, 2005

Michael B Milliams